

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Krysta Tremko,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

Capital Bank, *et al.*,

Defendant(s).

2:24-cv-00307-APG-MDC

**Order Denying:**

**Stipulated Discovery Plan (ECF No. 66)**

**Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 67)**

Pending before the Court are the *Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order* (“Stipulated Discovery Plan”) (ECF No. 66) and the *Stipulated Protective Order* (ECF No. 67).

**I. Stipulated Discovery Plan (ECF No. 66)**

The Court denies the *Stipulated Discovery Plan* (ECF No. 66) because the proposed plan requests more than 180 days for discovery without explanation and does not comply with LR 26-1(a).

**II. Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 67)**

The Court denies the *Stipulated Protective Order* (ECF No. 67) because the proposed stipulation suggests that designating documents as confidential is sufficient to seal such documents, which it is not. The stipulation also fails to specifically address LR IA 10-5 or *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006), and its progeny, and the requirement to file a separate motion to seal.

ACCORDINGLY,

**IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. The *Stipulated Discovery Plan* (ECF No. 66) IS DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE and with leave to re-file in compliance with LR 26-1(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Hon. Maximiliano D. Couvillier III  
United States Magistrate Judge